

**EVALUATION METHODOLOGY  
FOR PROPOSALS POLICY  
(INFORMED AVERAGING)**



**IMPLEMENTATION GUIDELINES  
EFFECTIVE JUNE 1, 2009**

# **IMPLEMENTATION GUIDELINES**

## **FOR "EVALUATION METHODOLOGY FOR PROPOSALS" POLICY**

---

This document ("Guidelines") provides instructions on how to implement the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors ("Board") Evaluation Methodology for Proposals, Policy No. 5.054. These Guidelines address the following areas:

- Introduction/Background
- Department Responsibilities
- Description of the Informed Averaging Methodology

### **1.0 Introduction/Background**

On March 31, 2009, the Board approved an Evaluation Methodology for Proposals, Policy No. 5.054. The goals of the Policy are to provide a standardized process that is consistent, objective, fair, and which can be properly documented. As described in the Policy, the Informed Averaging methodology is the County standard for scoring and evaluating competitive solicitations. As referenced in these Guidelines, "competitive solicitation" includes Request for Proposals, Request for Statement of Qualifications, and other solicitations where proposals are evaluated and scored by a committee that considers several factors, such as qualifications, experience, work plan, and price.

Consistent with the March 31, 2009 Board action, effective June 1, 2009, all departments are directed to utilize the Informed Averaging methodology in evaluating proposals received as a result of competitive solicitations. Exceptions to the use of this methodology must have formal Board approval prior to releasing a solicitation document.

These Guidelines are intended to provide County departments with assistance relative to the application of the Informed Averaging methodology. Sample evaluation instructions and evaluation documents are attached to these Guidelines for instructional purposes only. These Guidelines do not prohibit departments from establishing their own evaluation instructions, evaluation documents and accompanying protocols, provided they are consistent with the overall principles of the Informed Averaging methodology.

### **2.0 Department Responsibilities**

Departments are responsible for maintaining the integrity of the evaluation process by, at a minimum, ensuring the following:

- 2.1 Clearly defining an evaluation process that includes, at a minimum:  
(a) instructions that evaluators are to arrive at scores independently; (b) any revisions to scores are made at the individual evaluator's discretion and are properly documented; and (c) evaluation documents are retained to provide an audit trail of the evaluation process.
- 2.2 Developing evaluation documents that comply with the Informed Averaging methodology and that are tailored to the department's unique solicitation requirements.

# **IMPLEMENTATION GUIDELINES**

## **FOR “EVALUATION METHODOLOGY FOR PROPOSALS” POLICY**

---

- 2.3 Determining the size and composition of the evaluation committee. It is recommended that the evaluation committee consist of at least three evaluators with attention given to subject matter expertise in categories related to the contracted services.
- 2.4 Assigning a facilitator that will schedule and conduct all meetings with the evaluation committee. The facilitator must be familiar with County contracting policies and procedures, and is tasked with ensuring compliance with these County contracting policies and procedures. The facilitator is not a voting member of the evaluation committee.
- 2.5 Coordinating the evaluation process and ensuring that all evaluation documents (as defined in Section 3.0 below of these Guidelines) are retained consistent with the Board-approved Countywide Record Retention Schedule for contracts and contract-related documents.

### **3.0 Informed Averaging Scoring Methodology**

The department designates a facilitator who is familiar with County contracting policies and procedures. The facilitator is tasked with managing the integrity of the evaluation process but is not a voting member of the evaluation committee.

The department develops evaluation documents that are consistent with the solicitation document and identify categories being evaluated, weights given to each category, and clear instructions. Without limiting the foregoing, the evaluation documents also identify any categories of the evaluation that will be reviewed by one or more subject matter experts. These categories typically include reviews of references, County's Contract Database, contract terminations, pending judgments/litigation, financial capability, labor law violations, and exceptions to the sample contract, as well as to review of proposers' cost proposals and, if applicable, the cost effectiveness of such cost proposals (Proposition A).

Departments may continue using any existing processes for reviews by subject matter experts, provided that: (1) departments document such processes in the evaluation documents and communicate such processes to the evaluation committee; (2) if the processes include having evaluators score any categories reviewed by subject matter experts (as opposed to subject matter experts assigning the scores), such scoring must be in accordance with the Informed Averaging methodology; and (3) such processes do not conflict with these Guidelines. Additionally, documentation supporting the subject matter expert's review will be considered a part of the evaluation documents and therefore retained by departments in accordance with these Guidelines.

An initial meeting is scheduled and held with the identified evaluation committee members. The facilitator distributes all relevant documents to the evaluators, including the solicitation document, proposals that met the minimum requirements, and one set of individual evaluation worksheets for each proposal. The proposal evaluation instructions are discussed to ensure the evaluators understand their responsibilities and the evaluation process (Exhibit 1).

## **IMPLEMENTATION GUIDELINES FOR "EVALUATION METHODOLOGY FOR PROPOSALS" POLICY**

---

Following the initial meeting, evaluators independently review and score the proposals by utilizing the solicitation document and individual evaluation worksheets. Each evaluator records his/her score and corresponding comments for each rating factor on his/her individual evaluation worksheet (Exhibit 2). All evaluator's comments, notes, questions, etc., are included only on the individual evaluation worksheets and appropriately support the assigned ratings.

The evaluation committee convenes to discuss the individual scores assigned to each rating factor. The purpose of the meeting is to discuss the basis for individual scores, but not for the evaluators to agree upon a particular score.

After the group discussion and the meeting concludes, each evaluator is given an option to revise his/her scores and corresponding comments. Evaluators make independent determinations for any revisions in scores and/or comments based on their review and understanding of additional information they may have obtained by the group discussion. In the event that a score is revised, the evaluator strikes out the original score, documents the new score and provides comments to support the revised rating. Any changes are initialed by the evaluator (see Exhibit 3). This is a recommended method to be used, however, additional methods for documenting a score change can be utilized provided there is a clear audit trail of the evaluation scoring throughout the process.

If the evaluation process includes components such as oral interviews, product demonstrations and/or site visits, the facilitator coordinates those with the evaluators. Individual evaluator scoring and any subsequent evaluation committee meetings with respect to such components must be conducted in accordance with the Informed Averaging methodology.

Once all ratings are finalized and documented, each evaluator signs the last page of their individual evaluation worksheets. The facilitator then collects all individual evaluation worksheets and transfers each evaluator's scores from his/her respective individual evaluation worksheet onto the final evaluation scoring worksheet (Exhibit 4). The scores are then mathematically averaged to obtain a final score for each rating factor as well as an overall total score for each proposal.

As referenced in these Guidelines, "evaluation documents" are defined as each evaluator's individual evaluation worksheets and the final evaluation worksheet. If subject matter experts are utilized, "evaluation documents" additionally includes documentation supporting the subject matter experts' review. Departments are not to discard, shred or destroy any evaluation documents utilized to form the basis for the contract award until such documents would normally be discarded consistent the Board-approved Countywide Record Retention Schedule for contracts and contract-related documents.

**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES****DEPARTMENT NAME****SERVICES – SOLICITATION NO. \_\_\_\_\_****PROPOSAL EVALUATION INSTRUCTIONS**

These instructions, individual evaluation worksheets, proposals and other material provided to you in connection with this evaluation (collectively, Evaluation Materials), remain **CONFIDENTIAL** during the evaluation phase to preserve the integrity of the solicitation process. The Evaluation Materials have been issued to you under the following conditions:

- For the internal use of \_\_\_\_\_ Department.
- All Evaluation Materials are to be returned to the evaluation committee facilitator upon completion of the evaluation process. No part of the Evaluation Materials may be reproduced.
- Evaluation Materials must not be left unattended, and must be stored in a facility commensurate with their sensitivity.

**Evaluator's Responsibilities**

- Evaluators must be present at all evaluation committee meetings.
- Each evaluator will receive the solicitation document, all proposals that met the minimum requirements and one set of individual evaluation worksheets for each proposal.
- Evaluators independently review and score the proposals by utilizing the solicitation document and individual evaluation worksheets. Each evaluator records his/her score and corresponding comments for each rating factor on his/her individual proposal evaluation worksheet. All evaluator's comments, notes, citations to proposal page numbers, questions, etc., are written only on the individual evaluation worksheets and appropriately support the assigned ratings. Evaluators must include comments for each score as well as notations of a proposal's page numbers to facilitate the scoring discussion.
- Evaluators shall not discuss the substance of the proposals or the evaluation process, with anyone, including other evaluators, the evaluation committee facilitator and subject matter experts, outside of the evaluation committee meetings.
- Evaluators must be consistent in their evaluations and rely only on the content of the proposals. Any prior experience or personal knowledge cannot be considered in the evaluation process.

**(NOTE TO DEPARTMENTS: Include instructions on reviews by subject matter experts.)**

- At the evaluation committee meetings, each evaluator presents and discusses his/her individual scores assigned to each rating factor. The purpose of the meeting is to discuss the basis for individual scores, but not for the evaluators to agree upon a particular score.
- After the group discussion and the meeting concludes, each evaluator is given an option to revise his/her scores and corresponding comments. Evaluators make independent determinations for any revisions in scores and/or comments based on their review and understanding of additional information they may have obtained by the group discussion.
- In the event that a score is revised, the evaluator must strike out the original score, document the new score and provide comments to support the revised rating. Any changes must be initialed by the evaluator. **(NOTE TO DEPARTMENTS: As indicated in the "Guidelines", additional methods for documenting a score can be utilized, however, the method must provide a clear audit trail of the evaluation scoring throughout the process.)** Once all ratings are documented, each evaluator signs the last page of their individual evaluation worksheets.

**SAMPLE**  
Instructions may vary by department  
based on service and internal  
established processes

**Operational Plan**  
**XYZ SERVICES - SOLICITATION NO. 000000**  
**INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION WORKSHEET**  
**RATER 1**

Exhibit 2

Proposer: Joe's Parking, Inc.

**INFORMED AVERAGING SCORING METHODOLOGY:**

Each category will have a rating factor of Exceeds, Meets, Weak or Not Met. The Exceeds category has a point range; all other categories have a fixed score attached to the rating. If the evaluators determine a proposal rates in the "Exceeds" category, the points assigned to that factor must be within the point range indicated on the worksheet. At no time can the proposal be rated lower or higher than the range of points for the "Exceeds" category, or the fixed score for any other rating factor selected.

Portions of the individual evaluation worksheet will be reviewed and scored by the contracts analyst/subject matter expert. These scores will be presented to the evaluators for inclusion into the worksheet. These areas have been identified throughout the worksheet.

**PROPOSAL WORKSHEET RATING FACTOR DEFINITIONS:**

**Exceeds**

This rating should be given when the proposal clearly presents enough information that indicates a higher level than what is required in the RFP. For example, if the factor being evaluated is the requirement of three years experience and the proposal clearly indicates that the firm has ten years of experience and has provided dates to validate that claim, then they have exceeded this requirement of the RFP.

**Meets**

This rating should be given when the proposal presents enough information to ascertain compliance with the requirement of the RFP factor being rated - no more and no less. Using the previous example, if the proposal only includes dates verifying that the firm has three years of experience (and no more), then a rating of "meets" would be appropriate.

**Weak**

This rating should be given if there is questionable compliance, or if the discussion of the RFP requirement is brief or merely an affirmation that the proposer will comply with the RFP requirement being rated. Using the previous example, if the firm said they had three years experience, but did not support it with appropriate dates or client references, then a rating of "weak" is appropriate.

**Not Met**

This rating should be given in two situations: 1) the proposal does not address or acknowledge a certain RFP factor, or 2) the proposal indicates an inappropriate or different response to what is being asked for in the RFP. Using the previous example, a "not met" rating would be appropriate if the firm did not include anything about its experience.

**SAMPLE**  
Instructions may vary by department  
based on service and internal  
established processes

**Operational Plan**  
**XYZ SERVICES - SOLICITATION NO. 000000**  
**INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION WORKSHEET**  
**RATER 1**

**Exhibit 2**

<b>Proposer: Joe's Parking, Inc.</b>					
<b>BUSINESS PROPOSAL (50% - 5000 maximum points)</b>					
<b>1 Proposer's Qualifications (10% - 1000 maximum points)</b>	Exceeds 500- 400	Meets 350	Weak 150	Not Met 0	
<b>1A. Proposer's Background and Experience (5% - 500 maximum points)</b> <b>(Sub-paragraph 2.9.4 A., Proposal Section B. 1)</b>  Evaluation of the Proposer's qualifications, experience, and capacity as a corporation or other entity to perform the required services based on information provided in the RFP. Section B.1 - Proposer's Background and Experience.  Consider years of experience in providing parking facilities management services; types of parking facilities operated such as self-parked, valet, stacked) number of spaces, annual gross revenue, period of time proposer has operated each facility, etc.)		350			
Evaluator's Comments:  Proposer has over 10 years of experience in managing parking facilities and generates over \$1 million (Page 2)					
Review under Section 1B. (References) will be completed by the contracts analyst/subject matter experts. Findings and scores will be presented at the evaluation meeting for inclusion into the final score. See contracts analyst/subject matter expert's supporting documentation.					
<b>1B. References (5% - 500 points maximum)</b> <b>(Sub-paragraph 2.9.4 B., Proposal Section B.2)</b>	Good 166.3	Fair 116	Poor 0		
Reference #1 <u>ABC County</u>	166.3				
Reference #2 <u>Green Park</u>	166.3				
Reference #3 <u>Event Management, Inc.</u>	166.3				
<b>Total Points for References</b>	500 (rounded)				
Review under Section 1C. (Other performance) will be completed by the contracts analyst/subject matter experts. Findings and scores will be presented at the evaluation meeting for inclusion into the final score. See contracts analyst/subject matter expert's supporting documentation.					
<b>1C. Other performance</b> <b>(Sub-paragraph 2.9.4 C., Proposal Section B.3)</b>  Review of the County's Contract Database reflects a negative past performance history on County contracts. If no negative performance history, there would be no deductions and a rating of 'good' would be assigned. Disclosure of the number and type of contract terminations. Do terminations show a pattern of corporate behavior that is likely to continue? If so, is this pattern detrimental to the County? Disclosure of the number and type of judgments or pending litigation that may interfere with current contracts or prohibit Proposer from entering into new contracts? Are such judgments sufficient to alter the Proposer's financial capabilities?	Good 0	Fair (600-800)	Poor (1000-1200)		
Points Deducted	0				
<b>Proposer's Qualifications</b> <b>(Sub-paragraph 2.9.4, Proposal Sections B.1, B.2, and B.3)</b> (Transfer points to the Summary – page 00)	<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	850			

**SAMPLE**  
Instructions may vary by department  
based on service and internal  
established processes

**Operational Plan**  
**XYZ SERVICES - SOLICITATION NO. 0000000**  
**INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION WORKSHEET**  
**RATER 1**

**Exhibit 2**

2. Proposer's Approach to Providing Required Services and Quality Control Plan (30% - 3000 maximum points)		Proposer: Joe's Parking, Inc.			
<b>A. Proposers' Approach to Providing Required Services (20%-2000 maximum points)</b>					
<b>Operational Plan</b>		Exceeds 1600-2000	Meets 1400	Weak 600	Not Met 0
<p>Evaluate how the Proposer addresses the following factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed Start Up Operations - implementation plan for providing the required services, including the training of new staff, installation of parking equipment, signage, number of type of equipment owned or available and time schedule to implement transition phase.</li> <li>• Experience in working with electronic, automated parking equipment and the type of equipment utilized.</li> <li>• Methods and procedures of deployment of staff and ensuring coverage for Parking Facilities with one attendant to accommodate staff breaks, scheduled vacations, and unscheduled absences.</li> <li>• Proposed contingency plans for ensuring the continuation of required services in the event of personnel shortages or in the event the County requests to remove/add staff.</li> </ul>		2000			
<b>B. Quality Control Plan (10%-1000 maximum points)</b>					
<p>Evaluate the Proposer's demonstrated ability to establish and maintain a complete Quality Control Plan, including the following factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Activities to be monitored to ensure compliance with all Contract requirements;</li> <li>• Monitoring methods to be used;</li> <li>• Frequency of monitoring;</li> <li>• Samples of forms to be used in monitoring;</li> <li>• Title/level and qualifications of personnel performing monitoring functions; and</li> <li>• Documentation methods of all monitoring results, including any corrective action taken.</li> </ul>		800-1000	700	300	0
<b>Evaluator's Comments:</b>					
Proposer provided business and operational enhancements/recommendations custom to each parking facility lot (pg. 25), including staffing level, duties, and responsibilities. Proposer provided extensive information regarding the type and experience of automated parking equipment (pg. 30). Proposer described deployment of staff by scheduling at least 2 persons per opening time so that if one is late the second person is available (Table 1 of Proposal). Proposer addressed contingency plans by stating they have 600 employees, which allows them to draw from an extensive and highly trained labor pool (pg. 35).					
<b>Subtotal for Proposer's Approach to Providing Required Services and Quality Control Plan</b>					
<b>(Sub-paragraph 2.9.5, Proposal Section C &amp; Sub-Paragraph 2.9.6, Section D)</b>		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>POINTS</b>	<u>2300</u>	
( <i>Transfer points to the Summary – page 00</i> )					

**SAMPLE**  
Instructions may vary by department  
based on service and internal  
established processes

**Operational Plan**  
**XYZ SERVICES - SOLICITATION NO. 0000000**  
**INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION WORKSHEET**

**RATER 1**

**Review under Section 3.A. and 3.B. (Living Wage Compliance) will be completed by the contracts analysts/subject matter experts. Findings and scores will be presented at the evaluation meeting for inclusion into the final score. See contracts analysts/subject matter expert's supporting documentation.**

		<b>Proposer: Joe's Parking, Inc.</b>			
		<b>Evaluator's Comments:</b> Proposer presented automated labor-payroll record keeping systems. No information provided as to how proposer ensures breaks are taken. Overtime hours are automatically calculated but rate was not provided.			
		<b>Living Wage Compliance</b> (Transfer points to the Summary – page 00)		<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	
<b>3.</b>	Living Wage Compliance (10% - 1000 maximum points) (Section G)	<input type="radio"/> PASS	<input type="radio"/> FAIL	<b>Meets 700</b>	<b>Weak 300</b>
<b>3A.</b>	Financial Capability (Sub-paragraph 2.9.9 A., Proposal Section G) will be evaluated by an independent third party who will make an Acceptable/Unacceptable recommendation to the committee.	<input type="radio"/> PASS	<input type="radio"/> FAIL	<b>Exceeds 800-1000</b>	<b>Not Met 0</b>
<b>3B.</b>	Proposer's Staffing Plan (Sub-paragraph 2.9.9 B., Proposal Section G) Address the appropriateness, scope, and suitability of proposer's response to the staffing plan as identified on each Parking Facility Specification Sheet.	<input type="radio"/> PASS	<input type="radio"/> FAIL		
<b>3C.</b>	<b>Living Wage Compliance (Section G)</b>				
	<p>Proposer's Approach to Labor-Payroll Record Keeping and Regulatory Compliance (Sub-paragraph 2.9.9 F., Proposal Section F) Evaluate the appropriateness, scope, and suitability of the firm's employee labor-Payroll record keeping system and the controls in place that ensures ongoing regulatory compliance. Did the firm include, at a minimum, a detailed discussion of each of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What system does the firm use to document employee's arrival and departure Times (e.g., time clock system, sign-in/sign-out via computer, sign-in/sign-out sheets, etc.)?</li> <li>• How does the firm ensure that employees take mandated breaks and meal breaks?</li> <li>• Is the firm's labor-payroll record keeping system manual or automated?</li> <li>• Does the firm prepare the payroll or is it contracted out to a third party?</li> <li>• How does the firm calculate the total wages for individual employees at multiple wage rates (County's Living Wage rate for County work and firm's standard rate for other work) to ensure straight time hours, overtime hours, and travel time are paid to employees at the appropriate rates?</li> <li>• Is the system automated to handle variable payroll calculations or does the firm need to manually override the system to perform the calculation?</li> </ul>				

**SAMPLE**  
Instructions may vary by department  
based on service and internal  
established processes

Operational Plan  
**XYZ SERVICES - SOLICITATION NO. 0000000  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION WORKSHEET**

RATER 1

Exhibit 2

Review under Section 4. (Exceptions to the Sample Contract) will be completed by the contracts analyst/subject matter expert's supporting documentation presented at the evaluation meeting for inclusion into the final score. See contracts analyst/subject matter expert's supporting documentation						Proposer: <u>Joe's Parking, Inc.</u>									
<p><b>4. Exceptions to the Sample Contract</b> (Sub-Paragraph 2.9.7, Proposal Section E)</p> <p>Were there any exceptions taken to the Sample Contract? (circle one) If yes, were proposed alternatives acceptable? (If yes, circle one)</p>						<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>No</th> <th>Yes/ Major (2000)</th> <th>Yes/ Minor (1000)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>Unacceptable 0</td> <td>Weak 500</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">TOTAL POINTS</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	No	Yes/ Major (2000)	Yes/ Minor (1000)	0	Unacceptable 0	Weak 500	TOTAL POINTS		0
No	Yes/ Major (2000)	Yes/ Minor (1000)													
0	Unacceptable 0	Weak 500													
TOTAL POINTS		0													
<p><b>Exceptions to Sample Contract</b> (Transfer points to the Summary – page 00)</p>						<b>POINTS AWARDED</b>									
<p><b>SUMMARY</b> This section is to be completed by evaluator prior to finalizing individual evaluation worksheet.</p> <p><b>BUSINESS PROPOSAL (50% - 5000 maximum points)</b></p>															
<p>1. Proposer's Qualifications (10%) - (1000 maximum points)</p>						850									
<p>2. Proposer's Approach to Providing Required Services and Quality Control Plans (30%) (3000 maximum points)</p>						2300									
<p>3. Living Wage Compliance –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Financial Capability</li> <li>B. Proposed Staffing Plan</li> <li>C. Labor-Payroll Record Keeping and Regulatory Compliance (10%)</li> </ul>						<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Pass</th> <th>Fail</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Pass</td> <td>Fail 700</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">(1000 maximum points)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Pass	Fail	Pass	Fail 700	(1000 maximum points)				
Pass	Fail														
Pass	Fail 700														
(1000 maximum points)															
<p>4. Exceptions to Sample Contract</p>						(Subtract Points)  <b>BUSINESS PROPOSAL TOTAL POINTS (50%)</b>									
						0  3850									

Print Evaluator's Name

Signature

Date

SAMPLE - with  
 Revised Score and  
 Comments

**DEPARTMENT NAME**  
**XYZ SERVICES - SOLICITATION NO. 000000**  
**INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION WORKSHEET**  
**RATER 1**

**Proposer:** Joe's Parking, Inc.

BUSINESS PROPOSAL (50% - 5000 maximum points)						
		Exceeds 500- 400	Meets 350	Weak 150	Not Met 0	
1	Proposer's Qualifications (10% - 1000 maximum points)  (Sub-paragraph 2.9.4)					
1A.	Proposer's Background and Experience (5% - 500 maximum points)  (Sub-paragraph 2.9.4 A., Proposal Section B. 1)	<i>Lia.</i> Evaluation of the Proposer's qualifications, experience, and capacity as a corporation or other entity to perform the required services based on information provided in the RFP, Section B.1 - Proposer's Background and Experience.  Consider years of experience in providing parking facilities management services; types of parking facilities operated such as self-parked, valet, stacked) number of spaces, annual gross revenue, period of time proposer has operated each facility, etc.)	<del>350</del> 500	X		
Evaluator's Comments: <i>Proposer has over 10 years of experience in managing parking facilities and generates over \$1 million. (Pg. 2)</i>						
Upon discussion with other committee members, proposer identified experience managing 70,000 parking spaces (page 5), generates over \$16 million, and provides multiple types of parking services, such as daily shuttle and event parking. Proposer provided this information in the "additional information" section of the proposal.						

**SAMPLE****SERVICES - SOLICITATION NO. \_\_\_\_\_**  
**FINAL EVALUATION SCORING WORKSHEET**

Exhibit 4

**Proposer: Joe's Parking, Inc.**

Average Score  
is derived by the sum of all rater's scores  
divided by the number of raters

Business Proposal Section	Maximum Points	Raters			Average Scores
		1	2	3	
<b>1. Proposer's Qualifications (10% -1000 maximum points)</b>					
1A. Background and Experience	500	500	500	350	450
1B. References	500	500	448	348	432
1C. Other Performance - County Database (Deductions)	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Subtotals:</b>	<b>1000</b>	<b>1000</b>	<b>948</b>	<b>698</b>	<b>882</b>
<b>2. Proposer's Approach to Providing Services and Quality Control Plan (30% - 3000 maximum points)</b>					
2A. Operational Plan	2000	2000	1400	1400	1600
2B. Quality Control Plan	1000	300	700	300	433
<b>Subtotals:</b>	<b>3000</b>	<b>2300</b>	<b>2100</b>	<b>1700</b>	<b>2033</b>
<b>3. Living Wage Compliance (10% - 1000 maximum points)</b>					
3A. Financial Capability	Pass/Fail	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
3B. Proposer Staffing Plan	Pass/Fail	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
3C. Proposer's Approach to Labor-Payroll Record Keeping and Regulatory Compliance (10%)	1000	700	700	700	700
<b>Business Proposal Subtotal (50% - 5000 maximum points):</b>	<b>5000</b>	<b>4000</b>	<b>3748</b>	<b>3098</b>	<b>3615</b>
<b>Deductions for Exceptions to Sample Contract:</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Business Proposal Total:</b>	<b>5000</b>	<b>4000</b>	<b>3748</b>	<b>3098</b>	<b>3615</b>